

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/680,794	10/07/2003	Michael H. Peronek	FCIE 2 13321-1	4799	
7590 03/16/2004			EXAMINER		
ROBERT V. VICKERS			KIM, EUGENE LEE		
FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN, MINNICH & McKEE 1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor Cleveland, OH 44114-2579			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER		
				PAPER NUMBER	
			3721	3721	

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

•	1						
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
o fire and a second of		10/680,794	PERONEK ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Eugene L Kim	3721				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence addres	is			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. Insions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	mely filed  ys will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communicity (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nication.			
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on						
/—	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>25-73</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed.  Claim(s) <u>25-73</u> is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex						
Priority (	under 35 U.S.C. § 119			40 m			
12)∐ a)i	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stag	ge			
Attachmen	t(s)						
2) Notice 3) Inform	te of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 10/2/2003	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:		·)			

Art Unit: 3721

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Double Patenting

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 25-73 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-50 of U. S. Patent No. 6,698,160 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: bottle support plate with support plate which has a pocket with a support ledge that mates with flange of container to partially inhibit rotation of the container.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application, which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

Application/Control Number: 10/680,794 Page 3

Art Unit: 3721

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 38, 39, 43, 44, 45, 65, 67-73 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peronek et al (#4,939,890). Peronek et al show a bottle support plate in a rotary capping machine with a container that has a flange which is supported by a pocket as shown in figure 2. The pocket is defined as the pocket formed by plate 77 that connects to wall 40 and plate 61a to form a u-shaped pocket. Peronek et al show a plurality of surfaces on the plates as shown in figure 2. Peronek et al disclose that it is conventional to have a star wheel, turret and a plurality of capper heads (col 6 lines 10+). Peronek et al show protrusions 88 that mate with the bottom flange. Peronek et al do not show the pocket supporting the outer periphery of the flange but rather shows the flange being supported/mated on the bottom by plate 81 with protrusions 88. Peronek et al disclose the flange 52 is locked in protrusions 88b (col 11 lines 22+). Peronek et al show a semicircular surface 95 which also engage the bottom flange. Peronek et al show a support plate that is removable from the star wheel by bolt means as shown in figure 2. Peronek et al disclose that the positive locking connection of the flange 52 into protrusions 88b to positively resist rotation of the bottle within the capper pocket 13 (col 10 lines 30+). Since both pockets are performing the same mechanical function of inhibiting rotation, the actual location of where the plate

Application/Control Number: 10/680,794

Art Unit: 3721

engages the flange is a matter of design choice and a mere application of location of parts. See in re Japikse, 86 USPQ 70(CCPA 1950). Regarding the odd number of straight surfaces to accommodate a flange of a container having the shape of a pentagon, the examiner notes that the particular configuration as claimed is nothing more than one of numerous configurations a person of ordinary skill in the art would find obvious for mating surfaces. See in re Dailey, 149 USPQ 47 (CCPA 1976).

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Eugene L Kim whose telephone number is 703 308-1886. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday 8 a.m. to 6 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi Rada can be reached on 703 308-2187. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

EUGENE KIM
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Gar h